

Remarks

Claims 1-45 were previously pending, of which, claims 1 and 13 have been amended and claims 2-12 and 14-24 remain in their original form, and claims 25-45 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added by way of the foregoing amendments. Support for the foregoing amendments can be found in at least paragraphs [0027-29]. Reconsideration of this application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Office Action indicated that “[a]s per claims 1-24, the examiner is unable to determine how or when the pricing decision is made by using the case summary document.” The claims have been amended to recite in part, “wherein the case summary document includes a pricing option associated with a product or service that is to be provided for the customer.” Thus, the rejection of claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. §112 should be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims have been amended to include an output that is a practical application, “wherein the case summary document includes a pricing option associated with a product or service that is to be provided for the customer.” Support for the amendment can be found in at least paragraphs [0027-29] of the present application. Accordingly, it is believed that claims 1-24 are directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101 and thus, the rejection to claims 1-24 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is clear from the foregoing that independent claims 1 and 13 are in condition for allowance. Claims 2-12 and 14-24 depend from, either directly or indirectly, and further limit independent claims 1 and 13 and therefore are allowable as well.

An formal notice of allowance of claims 1-24 is requested. Should the Examiner deem that an interview with Applicants' undersigned attorney would expedite consideration, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Liem Do

Liem T. Do
Reg. No. 59,804

Date: 10-17-07

HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
901 Main Street, Suite 3100
Dallas, Texas 75202-3789
Telephone: 972-739-8643
IP Facsimile: 214-200-0853

R-178826_1.DOC

Certificate of Service
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via EFS-Web on <u>Oct. 17, 2007</u> .
<u>Bonnie Boyle</u> Name